

RECEIVED

2005 MAR -4 PM 3:56

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc
333 Commerce Street
Suite 2101
Nashville, TN 37201-3300

guy.hicks@bellsouth.com

T.R.A. DOCKET ROOM
March 4, 2005

Guy M Hicks
General Counsel

615 214 6301
Fax 615 214 7406

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Hon. Deborah Taylor Tate, Hearing Officer
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37238

Re: *Petition to Establish Generic Docket to Consider Amendments to
Interconnection Agreements Resulting from Changes of Law*
Docket No. 04-00381

Dear Director Tate:

Enclosed are the original and fourteen copies of BellSouth's Proposed Issues List. This list was provided to the intervenors on February 11. The parties are currently in the process of attempting to develop an agreed issues list. We look forward to the status conference on Tuesday, March 8.

Copies of the enclosed are being provided to counsel of record.

Very truly yours,

Guy M. Hicks

GMH:ch

CHANGE OF LAW GENERIC DOCKET ISSUES MATRIX

NO.	ISSUE DESCRIPTION
1	FINAL RULES: Should existing Interconnection Agreements previously approved by the TRA be amended to include the FCC's transition plan for switching, loops and transport as detailed in the FCC's Triennial Review Remand Order ("TRRO"), issued February 4, 2005.
2	MANDAMUS: In the event the FCC's TRRO is vacated or otherwise modified by a court of competent jurisdiction, should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to be consistent with the court's order as of the effective date of the order?
3	TRO – LINE SHARING: Pursuant to the 96 Act, are ILECs required to provide line sharing to new customers of CLECs after October 1, 2004?
4	TRO – LINE SHARING – TRANSITION: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to include the FCC's ordered transition (found in the TRRO) for existing CLEC line sharing arrangements?
5	TRO – LINE SPLITTING: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to remove the existing line splitting provisions and provide only that the ILEC will assist in facilitating line splitting?
6	TRO – SUB-LOOP CONCENTRATION: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to eliminate any requirement that the ILEC unbundle the sub loop components identified as sub-loop feeder and sub-loop concentration?
7	TRO – PACKET SWITCHING: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to eliminate any requirement that the ILEC unbundle packet switching, including but not limited to routers and DSLAMs?
8	TRO – CALL-RELATED DATABASES: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to eliminate any requirement that the ILEC provide call-related databases in any situation other than when it provides switching?

NO.	ISSUE DESCRIPTION
9	TRO – GREENFIELD AREAS: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to provide that the ILEC is not required to offer unbundled access to newly-deployed or 'greenfield' fiber loops, including fiber loops deployed to the minimum point-of-entry-(“MPOE”) of a multiple dwelling unit that is predominantly residential regardless of the ownership of the inside wiring from the MPOE to each end user?
10	TRO – HYBRID LOOPS: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to provide that the ILEC is only required to offer unbundled access to the TDM portion of the hybrid loop?
11	TRO – END USER PREMISES: Under the FCC's definition of a loop found in 47 C.F.R. §51.319(a), is a mobile switching center or cell site an “end user customer's premises”?
12	TRO – ROUTINE NETWORK MODIFICATION: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to remove any requirement that ILECs provide network modifications to CLECs, such as line conditioning, in situations where the ILEC would not make such modifications for its own end users?
13	TRO – ROUTINE NETWORK MODIFICATION: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to provide for the recovery of the cost of a Routine Network Modification that is not already recovered in the Commission-approved recurring or nonrecurring charges?
14	TRO – FIBER TO THE HOME: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to provide that an ILEC has no obligation to provide unbundled access to overbuild fiber to the home facilities except where the ILEC is retiring an existing copper facility, in which case the ILEC has an obligation to provide a 64kbps transmission path?
15	TRO – EELS AUDITS: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Section 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to allow ILECs to hire an independent auditor to conduct yearly AICPA-compliant audits to verify whether all EELs purchased by CLECs comply with the requirements of the TRO?
16	TRO - ENTERPRISE SWITCHING: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Sections 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to eliminate any obligation for BellSouth to provide enterprise switching, as that term is defined in the TRO?
17	252(i): Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Sections 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to incorporate the FCC's “entire agreement” rule regarding 252(i)?
18	TRO – TRANSPORT: Should all ICAs negotiated or arbitrated under Sections 251 and 252 of the 96 Act be deemed amended to define dedicated transport to only include DS0 level facilities between switches and wire centers owned by BellSouth?

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 4, 2005, a copy of the foregoing document was served on the following, via the method indicated:

☐ Hand
☐ Mail
☐ Facsimile
☐ Overnight
☒ Electronic

Henry Walker, Esquire
Boult, Cummings, et al.
1600 Division Street, #700
Nashville, TN 37219-8062
hwalker@boultcummings.com

☐ Hand
☐ Mail
☐ Facsimile
☐ Overnight
☒ Electronic

James Murphy, Esquire
Boult, Cummings, et al.
1600 Division Street, #700
Nashville, TN 37219-8062
jmurphy@boultcummings.com

☐ Hand
☐ Mail
☐ Facsimile
☐ Overnight
☒ Electronic

Ed Phillips, Esq.
United Telephone - Southeast
14111 Capitol Blvd.
Wake Forest, NC 27587
Edward.phillips@mail.sprint.us

☐ Hand
☐ Mail
☐ Facsimile
☐ Overnight
☒ Electronic

H. LaDon Baltimore, Esquire
Farrar & Bates
211 Seventh Ave. N, # 320
Nashville, TN 37219-1823
don.baltimore@farrar-bates.com

☐ Hand
☐ Mail
☐ Facsimile
☐ Overnight
☒ Electronic

John J. Heitmann
Kelley Drye & Warren
1900 19th St., NW, #500
Washington, DC 20036
jheitmann@kelleydrye.com

☐ Hand
☐ Mail
☐ Facsimile
☐ Overnight
☒ Electronic

Charles B. Welch, Esquire
Farris, Mathews, et al.
618 Church St., #300
Nashville, TN 37219
cwelch@farrismathews.com


